



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(Potiphar . . . when Joseph (the ox, cf. שׁוֹר Deut. xxxiii. 17) came to him, became *enlightened*, i.e. he forsook idolatry. The Byzantians used the word *φώτισμα*, "enlightenment," to denote "repudiation of paganism, acceptance of Christianity, baptism," hence *φωτίζειν*, to baptize. The Jews in the Byzantine empire then used the word to denote "rejection of idolatry." Thus, in *Jelamdenu*, the name Phutiel, one of Jethro's names, is explained thus: שְׁהָאִיר *שְׁהָאִיר פוֹטִיא* במעשים טובים שאתה אומר ביוני פוֹטִיא, "He *shone* by good actions, which in Greek is called *φῶτα*."

The excellency of the work as a whole induced me to draw attention to some errors it contains.

J. FÜRST.

THE OLD LATIN VERSION OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

De Veteris Latinae Ecclesiastici capitibus i-xliii, una cum notis ex eiusdem libri translationibus aethiopica, armeniaca, copticis, latina altera, syro-hexaplari depromptis, scripsit Dr. Theol. Henr. Herkenne (Leipzig, 1899).

THE object of this work, as stated in the introduction, is to investigate the origin and critical character of the Old Latin version of Ecclesiasticus, and to restore or emend the Greek by means of it. It therefore bears only indirectly on questions affecting the Hebrew text, although, as it was begun some two years before Dr. Schechter's discovery of the first leaf of the Hebrew, and was published before the appearance of the latest instalment from Cambridge, there is a considerable interest attaching to Dr. Herkenne's restorations of the underlying Hebrew text or texts. In a very carefully written introduction Dr. Herkenne first gives a bibliography of works on the Hebrew text and various versions of the book, and then discusses the value of the versions severally, after which follows a detailed commentary on the first forty-three chapters of the Old Latin (VL). That VL was translated from the Greek Dr. Herkenne concludes from its general agreement with that version, and also on the following special grounds:—(a) Greek words are often merely transcribed, e.g. cataclysmus (κατακλυσμός), eremus (ἐρημος); and Latin words are formed on a Greek pattern, e.g. inhonoratio (ἀτιμία), ineruditio (ἀπαιδευσία); (b) in some passages the VL has misunderstood the Greek; (c) differences can sometimes be explained either by an emendation or by a corruption of the Greek, for which in many

cases MS. authority can be found; (*d*) mistakes in the Greek are sometimes retained in VL. In the majority of cases, however, the differences cannot be explained either by *b* or *c*, and on this ground it has sometimes been held that VL was made from the Hebrew, or that divergences are due to the translator's having consulted a Hebrew text in certain passages. The latter view is in itself improbable, and moreover Dr. Herkenne shows that part of the variants of VL is supported by one or other MS. of the Greek, while part is to be found in a Greek form in patristic literature. It must nevertheless be admitted that VL is not altogether independent of a Hebrew source, since (*a*) some of the variants have a Hebrew colouring; (*b*) the differences between VL and the Greek can sometimes be explained only by a difference in the Hebrew text; (*c*) in some cases VL agrees (against the Greek) with the Syriac, which was made from Hebrew. [This argument is therefore ultimately the same as *b*.] The final conclusion is that VL rests on a Greek text revised according to a Hebrew text differing from that which is the basis of the received Greek. The underlying Hebrew he denotes by *g*, and considers that it is possible, in some cases at least, to re-establish its readings. The whole question is very clearly argued, and supported by numerous instances, but it is difficult to agree with the proposal to reconstruct *g*. There must generally be an uncertainty in restoring an original from a version, much more therefore in getting down to a second stratum, restoring an original from the version of a version. No doubt the agreement of VL with one or other of the versions often seems to point to a particular Hebrew reading in *g*, but the possibilities of error are so many that even after a very thorough investigation it is seldom certain that the coincidence is not due to some such cause as corruption or misunderstanding within the particular versions. For this reason it is important that the versions should be critically studied. The present work and the monograph of Dr. N. Peters on the Coptic versions (*Biblische Studien*, III, 3) show what there is to be done. As to the existence of *g* there can be little doubt, for many reasons tend to the conviction that from comparatively early times various recensions of the Hebrew text were current. Nor is this surprising. In the case of a book which was neither sacred, nor had received the *imprimatur* of the schools, a scribe was under no necessity of abiding by his copy. In fact, he considered himself to be doing the author service by correcting, amplifying, or improving his work, and it is important to bear this in mind with regard to Ecclesiasticus. Granting Dr. Herkenne's contention, it must be agreed that since VL is a careful, literal version, it is of great value for the criticism of the text, following, as

it does, a corrected recension of the Greek. He places it next in importance after the Greek and Syriac, and holds that sometimes it alone has preserved the true reading of the Hebrew. It is also possible, in his opinion, to gather some details as to the *form* of the Hebrew MS. from which the grandson made his translation. Thus (a) it was written continuously, not *σπλιχρῶς*, and perhaps without division of words; (b) it had contractions, and possibly omissions; (c) words were sometimes transposed or out of place in it. As regards the Greek MS. underlying VL, (a) it was free from the disarrangement of chapters occurring in various extant Greek MSS. and in some versions; (b) it was probably written in columns, with notes between them; (c) it was written continuously, without division of words; (d) it had marginal notes, which have sometimes crept into the text; (e) the margin was injured in some places; (f) it had about twenty uncial letters to the line. If we sometimes hesitate to adopt Dr. Herkenne's conclusions on these points, we are none the less ready to admit the ingenuity and minute care displayed in his work.

The other versions may be more summarily dismissed. Among the less known of them perhaps the most interesting are the Coptic, of which small fragments exist in the Bohairic dialect, and nearly the whole in the Sahidic. That these two versions should agree to a large extent is only natural. The same is the case throughout the translations of the Bible in these two dialects, and probably, although the versions are distinct, the later was influenced by the earlier. It is noticeable that they agree largely with VL, the reason no doubt being that both go back to an earlier form of the Greek. The peculiarity of the Coptic (Sahidic) is its "erklärende Tendenz" (as pointed out by Dr. Peters), i. e. the endeavour to show (often erroneously) the logical connexion of the matter by the insertion of (Greek) particles even where they are lacking in its Greek original, a tendency which may often be observed in early versions of other books. The Armenian versions are, according to Dr. Herkenne, of inferior value for the text. The earlier of the two follows closely the ordinary Greek text, and is dependent on a single MS., from which it was first published in 1833 at Venice. Like the Syriac, it abounds in lacunae, and breaks off altogether at chap. xlii. 25. The most interesting variant it presents is in xl. 6 b, where it reads *καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἐνυπνίους ὥς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κοπιᾷ*. The Ethiopic version is of least value, owing to its paraphrastic character and to its author's defective knowledge of the Greek from which he translated.

Such are the main results of Dr. Herkenne's work. Without going into a detailed discussion of the commentary, enough has been said to

show that it is a real contribution to the study of the subject. It is to be hoped that the fruit of his accurate and patient investigation may stimulate other scholars to a similar study of the other versions of Ecclesiasticus.

A. COWLEY.

THE WISDOM OF BEN SIRA.

The Wisdom of Ben Sira. Portions of Ecclesiasticus from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Geniza Collection, presented to the University of Cambridge by the Editors. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by S. SCHECHTER, M.A., Litt.D., Reader in Rabbinic in the University of Cambridge, and Professor of Hebrew in University College, London, and C. TAYLOR, D.D., Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1899. [Pp. lxxxvii, 68 and (24).]

[PRELIMINARY NOTICE.]

THIS well-edited volume, taken together with the pages printed by the Rev. George Margoliouth in the present number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, exhausts the Fragments of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus which have been recovered from the Cairo Geniza. To Professor Schechter belongs the honour of identifying the very first Fragment found. But he has earned more than the praise of mere discovery. He has studied the texts with penetration, has illustrated them with fullness of learning, and has discussed them with critical insight. His Notes and Introduction to the Hebrew text before us are the first ripe fruit of his labours. He will no doubt have more to say when the batteries of scholars hostile to the pretensions of the Hebrew have been unmasked. In the Master of St. John's he has found a capable coadjutor, whose contribution to the Cambridge volume is worthy of his reputation. The English Translation with the Notes and Appendix to it are by Dr. Taylor; the Hebrew Text, the Introduction to it, and the Notes fall to the share of Professor Schechter.

The Fragments contained in this volume come from two MSS. MS. A consists of four leaves of paper very full of writing, and includes ch. iii. 6 to vii. 29, xi. 34 to xvi. 26. MS. B consists of seven leaves of paper. It comes from the same Codex as the Lewis-Gibson and the Bodleian Fragments, and contains ch. xxx. 11 to xxxiii. 3, xxxv. 9 to xxxvi. 21, xxxvii. 27 to xxxviii. 27, and xlix. 12 to the end